

Appln. Ser. No. 10/620,046
Reply to Office August 11, 2004 Action

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration of this patent application is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Claims 1, 11, 13 and 16 have been amended. Claim 12 has been cancelled without prejudice. New claims 18 and 19 have been added. No new matter has been introduced.

At pages 7-8 of the August 11, 2004 Office Action, the Examiner indicated that claims 8, 9, and 12-16 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claim 11 has been amended to incorporate the features of allowable claim 12 and claim 12 has been cancelled without prejudice. Claims 13 and 16 have been amended to depend from claim 11. New independent claim 19, which incorporates the features of former independent claim 1 and dependent claims 6, 7 and 8, has been added. Accordingly, Applicants believe that independent claims 11 and 19 and dependent claims 13-17, which all ultimately depend from claim 11 are in condition for

Appln. Ser. No. 10/620,046
Reply to Office August 11, 2004 Action

allowance.

Claims 1-4, 6, 7, 11 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by *Bright et al.*, U.S. Patent No. 4,343,524. Claim 1 was further rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as anticipated by *Hotea et al.*, U.S. Patent No. 6,568,955. Claim 10 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over *Bright et al.* in view of *Scheibner*, U.S. Patent No. 5,021,000. Claim 5 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over *Bright et al.* in view of *Eigenbrode et al.*, U.S. Patent No. 3,963,317.

Essentially, the Examiner's position was that *Bright et al.* discloses a contact having a stationary portion fixed to the insulator, a first portion with a first contact point being electrically continuous with the stationary portion, a substantially U-shaped portion continuous with the first portion, a second portion continuous with the substantially U-shaped portion and having a second contact point, and a movable portion continuous with the second portion which engages with an actuator, wherein the first and second contact points confront each other leaving a gap therebetween and the actuator slides to

Appln. Ser. No. 10/620,046
Reply to Office August 11, 2004 Action

displace the movable portion so that the first and second contact points sandwich a connection counterpart that is inserted in the gap. The *Hotea et al.* reference was said to show all of the elements recited in claim 1. The Examiner further stated that *Bright et al.* discloses a connector as recited in claim 10 except for a cam lock mechanism arranged so as not to project from the surface of the insulator, which was said to be taught by *Scheibner*. *Bright et al.* was said to disclose a connector as recited in claim 5, except for a driving screw screwed into the insulator and coupled with the actuator for moving the actuator relative to the insulator, which was said to be taught by *Eigenbrode et al.*

The rejections are respectively traversed.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite the following feature:

"...said movable portion confronting said stationary portion and extending longer than said stationary portion,..."

Claim 1, as amended, relates to a ZIF connector having a contact which comprises a stationary portion and a movable portion which confronts the stationary portion and extends longer

Appln. Ser. No. 10/620,046
Reply to Office August 11, 2004 Action

than the stationary portion. The movable portion of the contact is continuous with a second portion of the contact and engages with an actuator of the ZIF connector.

This structure allows a contact design wherein a second contact point can be positioned far from a portion engaged with the actuator. Such a design makes it possible to operate a ZIF connector as claimed by applying a small force by use of a lever.

Neither *Bright et al.* nor *Hotea et al.* disclose or suggest the claimed relation between the movable portion and stationary portion of a contact. Accordingly, Applicants believe claim 1 as amended is not anticipated by *Bright et al.* or *Hotea et al.* and is allowable over the references of record, considered singly or in combination. Additionally, Applicants believe claims 2-10 and 18, which all ultimately depend from claim 1 are in condition for allowance as well.

In summary, claims 1, 11, 13 and 16 have been amended and claim 12 has been cancelled without prejudice. Independent claim 11 has been amended to incorporate the features of allowable claim 12. New claims 18 and 19 have been added. Independent


Appln. Scr. No. 10/620,046
Reply to Office August 11, 2004 Action

claim 19 has been drafted to incorporate the features of
allowable claim 8, including the features of claims 1, 6, and 7.
No new matter has been introduced.

The Applicants believe that the remaining claims 1-19 are
written to overcome the rejections of the Examiner. Accordingly,
Applicants respectfully requests early allowance of the remaining
claims.

Respectfully submitted,
Osamu HASHIGUCHI ET AL - 1


COLLARD & ROE, P.C.
1077 Northern Boulevard
Roslyn, New York 11576
(516) 365-9802


Allison C. Collard, Reg.No.22,532
Edward R. Freedman, Reg.No.26,048
Frederick J. Dorchak, Reg.No.29,298
Elizabeth Collard Richter, Reg.No. 35,103
William C. Collard, Reg. No. 38,411
Edward J. Callaghan, Reg. No. 46,594
Attorneys for Applicant

Enclosure: Petition for One Month Extension of Time.

Fax No. 703-872-9306

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being sent by
facsimile transmission to the U.S.P.T.O. to Patent Examiner James R.
Harvey at Group No. 2833, to 1-703-872-9306 December 10, 2004.


Edward J. Callaghan